

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,103,663 to Inoue et al. ("*Inoue*").

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, and 47, and cancel claims 4, 8, 13, 17, 22, and 26. Claims 1-3, 4-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25, and 27 are currently pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-27 as allegedly anticipated by *Inoue*.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites an information processing apparatus comprising a "means for transmitting-a restoring request to restore the usage right identifying information, the restoring request including client identifying information for identifying the information processing apparatus, and data for verifying the restoring request, the data for verifying the restoring request including a hash value calculated based on a first encryption key specific to the information processing apparatus." *Inoue* fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed restoring request.

*Inoue* discloses a right management server that manages usage of content on a parent terminal and a child terminal (*Inoue*, abstract). The right management server receives a request to issue a license from the child terminal, generates a license ticket based on restriction rules from the parent terminal, and issues the license ticket to the child terminal (*Inoue*, abstract). *Inoue* also describes the structure of the license ticket

in FIG. 17a, and the license ticket can include a “hash value” calculated so that the license ticket can be verified (*Inoue*, col. 26, lines 4-18).

However, *Inoue*’s hash value cannot correspond to the claimed hash value. First, the claimed hash value is calculated based on an encryption key that is “specific to the information processing apparatus.” *Inoue* does not directly indicate that any particular key is used to create *Inoue*’s hash value. The only key *Inoue* discusses along with the “hash value” is a “decryption key for decrypting a content” (emphasis added) (*Inoue*, col. 26, lines 10-12). Thus, at best *Inoue*’s key is specific to the content and not to an apparatus.

Further, *Inoue* discloses that the license ticket, including the hash value, is sent in response to a “license ticket issuance request” from the child terminal (*Inoue*, abstract). The Office Action appears to identify *Inoue*’s license ticket as corresponding to the claimed “usage right” and *Inoue*’s license ticket issuance request as corresponding to the claimed “restoring request” (Office Action at p. 3). *Inoue*’s hash value is included in *Inoue*’s license ticket, and not the license ticket issuance request. Thus, because *Inoue*’s license ticket issuance request does not include a hash value, *Inoue*’s license ticket issuance request cannot constitute the claimed “restoring request ... including a hash value.”

For at least the reasons discussed above, *Inoue* does not teach or suggest a “means for transmitting-a restoring request to restore the usage right identifying information, the restoring request including client identifying information for identifying

the information processing apparatus, and data for verifying the restoring request, the data for verifying the restoring request including a hash value calculated based on a first encryption key specific to the information processing apparatus,” as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added). *Inoue* thus does not anticipate claim 1, and Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claim 1. Although of different scope than claim 1, *Inoue* does not anticipate independent claims 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 depend from claim 1, claims 7 and 9 depend from claim 6, claims 11, 12, and 14 depend from claim 10, claims 16 and 18 depend from claim 15, claims 20, 22, and 23 depend from claim 19, and claims 25 and 27 depend from claim 24. Because *Inoue* does not support the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), *Inoue* also does not support the rejection of these dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Reply, please charge  
the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2008

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220